



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,033	09/28/2001	Joshua R. Smith	103140-0012U1	7207
24267 7590 07/18/2011 CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP 88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210				
EXAMINER BROOKS, MATTHEW L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/18/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,033

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

MATTHEW BROOKS

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 21, 23, 24 and 48-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 21, 23, 24 and 48-51 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment/Req. Reconsideration-After Non-Final Reject filing on 05/03/2011.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 2, 21, 23, 24 and 48-51 are currently pending. The Applicant in last reply has made substantial amendments, which now make the claims much clearer. The same claims; now clearer, also make it clear that they are restrict-able proper; and are herein subject to a restriction requirement, reasons set forth below.

Priority

3. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

Claims Priority from Provisional Application 60236976, filed 09/29/2000

Child Data; 09865889, filed on 05/25/2001 ,now abandoned Claims Priority from

Provisional Application 60236976 , filed on 09/29/2000 09966033, filed on

09/28/2001 and having 3 RCE-type filings therein, Claims Priority from Provisional

Application 60236976 , filed on 09/29/2000; PCT/US01/30433, filed on 09/28/2001

Claims Priority from Provisional Application 60236976 , filed on 09/29/2000.

Election/Restrictions

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims **2 and 51**, drawn to a mail piece tracking system, which provides a table, with a complete record, including the "return"; classified in class 705, subclass 340.
 - II. Claims **21-24**, drawn to a computer readable medium to perform a method involving "notify the respective user of delivery status", classified in class 705, subclass 344.
 - III. Claims **48-50**, drawn to a "mail piece tracking system" comprising a server that maintains an index and a plurality of computer nodes; is classified in class 705, subclass 1.1.
5. A telephone call was made to Cesari and MCKENNA, 617-951-2500; and a voice message, left for Rita M. Rooney on 7/15/2011 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
6. In making a decision as to whether a Restriction is proper Examiner is to compare the claimed subject matter. MPEP 806.01 During the comparison the claims are considered to be in proper form and patentable/novel. Thus, Examiner must show the inventions are "independent" and/or "distinct". The inventions in this case the groups are distinct.

7. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I – II; the inventions are distinct if it can be shown that they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions and effects. Further, Inventions in this relationship are *distinct* if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations. (MPEP 806.05(c)). In the instant case Group 1 has particulars required, such as, provides a table, with a complete record, including the “return”; which put the claims in a different class. Group II as claimed does not require the particulars of the Group I as claimed because the Group I does not require (for instance “notify the respective user of delivery status”. Group III is different from Groups II and III in that it is clearly geared to an invention that is a “mail piece tracking system” comprising a server that maintains an index and a plurality of computer nodes. Further all three falls in a separate class(s).

8. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew L. Brooks whose telephone number is (571) 272-8112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 8 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jami Plucinski can be reached on (571) 272-6811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Matthew L. Brooks/
Primary Examiner, GAU 3629
7/18/2011